

## MEMORANDUM

1154

1195

V-B-B

#6

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

February 19, 1980

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR: ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI

FROM: THOMAS THORNTON

SUBJECT: Chile and Argentina (U)

see Bob Pastor's  
comments attached.

I sent you a memo for the VBB last Thursday on Chile and Argentina (attached). I understand that it was decided that State and DOD should battle the UNITAS issue out on their own. They have not come to a conclusion and David Newsom wants us to take a position and, presumably, decide the issue. I continue to recommend the following (please check your concurrence as appropriate):

1. Agree to UNITAS for Argentina.

Yes ✓

No

2. Disapprove UNITAS for Chile.  
(C)

Yes ✓

No

There is also an issue between State on (would you believe) whether or not a DOD cartographer's slot should be abolished as part of the Letellier crack-down. This is a matter of massive inconsequence from any point of view. Since DOD has taken a longer cut in percentage terms than other Embassy elements (and we would be scrubbing UNITAS for Chile) I suggest that we back DOD on this matter. Concur? Yes ☒ No ☐

Yes ☒

No

There is also the question of visits left over from the VBB although I don't think this is particularly contentious. Do you concur that:

1. Allen should be allowed to visit Argentina?

Yes ✓

No

2. The Galtieri invitation should be delayed?

Yes ✓

No

I still think the larger issue (discussed on page 2 of attached memo) needs resolution. If you do not want to burden the VBB with it, please let me know your preferences. Should we:

Substantially consider the Letilier phase over?

Continue to take follow-up actions influenced by it?

(C)

Attachment: February 13 V-B-B Memorandum

cc: Robert Pastor

Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Review on Feb. 19, 1986

~~Change to \_\_\_\_\_  
(☒) Release (☐) Exeise (☐) Deny (☒) Declassify  
Exemptions b (☐) (☐) E.O. 13526 25x (☐) (☐)  
Declassify after NSC  
With concurrence of: \_\_\_\_\_~~

obtained

~~not out~~

IPS by

Date \_\_\_\_\_

~~not out.~~  
~~12-14-16~~

## MEMORANDUM

Outside the System

Chron

## NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

#6A

February 13, 1980

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR: ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI  
FROM: THOMAS THORNTON  
SUBJECT: V-B-B Lunch -- Latin American Issues

DOD may bring up two Southern Cone issues:

1. Should the Argentinian Army Chief be invited to the US and our Chief of Air Staff go to Argentina?
2. Should we invite Chile and Argentina to participate in the annual UNITAS naval exercises? (C)

On the first point, I am in no tearing rush to issue the invitation -- the idea for which apparently came out of the Goodpaster mission. Even assuming that we want to invite Galtieri, I would want to hold off until we are sure that he does not appear as a human rights villain in the upcoming Interamerican Human Rights report. The visit of GEN Allen to Argentina (a tag-on to an already scheduled visit to Brazil) seems unobjectionable. I think that both of these visits would, however, be too much. Recommendation: O.K. for Allen; hold off on Galtieri for a while.

On the UNITAS maneuvers, I don't think that Argentina poses a problem. I understand that they have routinely participated in the past -- it makes no sense to cut them out now after (a) there has been some human rights improvement and (b) Goodpaster has been there. Derian wants to punish them for being uncooperative with us at the UNHRC meeting at Geneva.. This is not the instrument that I would use if, indeed, we want to show our displeasure. (C)

The Chile/UNITAS question is less clearcut. DOD wants to go ahead. The State position will be that we should not let the Chileans participate this year as one more punishment for the Letelier affair. I find that reasonable although it does raise a larger problem (see below). Recommendation: Yes on Argentina, No on Chile, keyed specifically to the Letelier case. I would not argue, however, if you decided otherwise on Chile. (C)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Review on Feb. 13, 1986

Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP  
Change to  
( ) Release ( ) Excise ( ) Deny ( ) Declassify  
Exemptions b ( ) ( ) E.O. 13526 25x ( ) ( )  
Declassify after \_\_\_\_\_  
With concurrence of: \_\_\_\_\_  
IPS by AS obtained \_\_\_\_\_ not obt. \_\_\_\_\_  
Date 12-14-16

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

2

The Larger Issue

The President authorized a number of steps in the Letelier case and these have been taken (or are about to be taken). The question arises as to whether we want to continue punishment of the Chileans on this issue. Do we want this to be a time-limited action or is it supposed to remain a semi-permanent factor in US-Chilean relations? The UNITAS issue is one example and there will be some others coming up shortly. My preference is to put the issue behind us -- the UNITAS decision would be our last one under its influence -- and judge future issues in US-Chilean relations on the basis of their merits and overall Chilean behavior. It is possible, however, that you, Vance and even the President may want to come down harder and more lastingly on the Chileans. If so, the bureaucracy needs guidance. (C)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. That you raise with Vance (and later, if necessary, the President) the question of whether we want to keep the pressure on the Chileans over the Letelier case or consider actions under it to be completed.
- B. That you take the latter position in the discussion.
- C. That you let me know the outcome. (C)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

1195

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

February 20, 1980

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

## INFORMATION

ZB HAS SEEN

MEMORANDUM FOR:

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI

FROM:

ROBERT PASTOR

SUBJECT:

Comments on Thornton's Memo on Chile (U)

Let me briefly comment on an important issue Tom raises in his memo:

"Should we consider the Letelier phase over?" The President made his decision to adopt a cool posture to Chile in late October; and in late November, the decisions were announced in a strong statement condemning Chilean government complicity in a heinous crime of international terrorism. I would pose Tom's question differently: How much staying power does the USG have? I think it would be a terrible embarrassment to the President if we proceeded with "business as usual," such as suggested by the UNITAS exercise, four months after he announces a strong and firm policy. (C)

With Mark Schneider running Kennedy's campaign, you can be absolutely certain that a decision to put the "Letelier phase" behind us and proceed with UNITAS will be noticed. And Kennedy is hungry for issues. Moreover, there is no good reason for us to go ahead with UNITAS; we are hardly in danger of losing Chile to anyone but the militarists. (C)

While I agree with Tom that the question of whether or not a DOD cartographer's slot should be abolished is an unimportant matter, Tom neglects to mention that one of the President's decisions was to reduce the size of our own mission. If all of us agree that this slot is unnecessary, then to be consistent with the President's decision it should be abolished. I see no reason why we should back DOD on this matter. (C)

cc: Tom Thornton

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Review 2/20/1990

Extended by Z. Brzezinski

Reason: NSC 1.13(f)

Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP  
Change to \_\_\_\_\_  
( ) Release ( ) Excise ( ) Deny ( ) Declassify  
Exemptions b ( ) ( ) E.O. 13526 25x ( ) ( )  
Declassify after \_\_\_\_\_  
With concurrence of: \_\_\_\_\_

Change to \_\_\_\_\_  
(☒) Release (☐) Excise (☐) Deny (☒) Declassify  
Exemptions b (☐) (☐) E.O. 13526 25x (☐) (☐)  
Declassify after \_\_\_\_\_

( ) Release ( ) Excise ( ) Deny ( ) Declassify

Exemptions b ( ) ( ) E.O. 13526 25x ( ) ( ) ( )

Declassify after

With concurrence of:

IPS by 11 obtained not obt.  
Date 12 14

IPS by                      Date 12/10/18

ID 8001154

NSC/S PROF

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

#6C

RECEIVED 19 FEB 80 18

TO BRZEZINSKI

FROM THORNTON

DOCDATE 19 FEB 80

KEYWORDS: CHILE

ARGENTINA

SUBJECT: VBB

ACTION: FOR DECISION

DUE: 21 FEB 80 STATUS ☒ FILES

FOR ACTION

FOR COMMENT

FOR INFO

BRZEZINSKI

PASTOR

**Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP**

Change to

☒ Release ☐ Excise ☐ Deny ☐ Declassify

Exemptions b ☐ ☐ E.O. 13526 25x ☐ ☐ ☐

Declassify after

With concurrence of:

IPS by ☒ obtained Date 12-14-16 not obt

COMMENTS

REF#

LOG 8001155

NSC/FID

( T / )

ACTION OFFICER (G) ASSIGNED

ACTION REQUIRED

DUE

COPIES TO

C 2/22 2B approved release RP, JF

DISPATCH

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 13526 SEC 3.5 (b)

WHITE HOUSE COMPLIANCE AUGUST 20, 1997

W/ATTCH

FILE

(C)

4